



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/562,546	12/29/2005	Gong-hyun Ryu	5TI-0053	6026
23413	7590	04/28/2009	EXAMINER	
CANTOR COLBURN, LLP			LEE, MICHAEL	
20 Church Street			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
22nd Floor			2622	
Hartford, CT 06103				
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/28/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

usptopatentmail@cantorcolburn.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/562,546	RYU, GONG-HYUN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	M. Lee	2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 January 2009.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1 and 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Morita et al. (2002/0051098).

Regarding claim 1, Morita discloses a main body (K) embedded in a dashboard wall including an accommodating part (KK), an input part with a plurality of input keys (note paragraph 0068), a television receiving circuit (paragraph 0067), inherently included speakers, and a controller 6, a monitor D, and a connecting part (note Figure 2).

Regarding claim 3, both Morita and Endo show inserting protrusions at the rear side of the monitor (note J axial in Morita and hinge 10 in Endo), and a bracket with protrusion holes at the main body (note J axial bracket in Morita and hinge bracket 10 in Endo).

Regarding claim 4, both Morita and Endo have grip portions on both sides of the monitor.

Regarding claim 5, the television receiver in Morita inherently includes all the features as claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morita et al. (2002/0051098) in view of Endo et al. (6,731,350).

Regarding claim 2, Morita shows a plurality of foldable supports (note Figure 2), and one end of the connecting part is fixed at a predetermined position of the accommodation part (note Figure 2). But Morita fails to show the hinge that rotates the monitor in the left and right directions as claimed. Endo, from the similar field of endeavor, discloses a hinge mechanism which enables the monitor to be rotated in the horizontal direction. Endo further teaches that by adjusting the monitor in the horizontal direction, the viewing angle of the user can be adjusted so that the viewing angle problem of conventional LCD display panel can be avoided (note col. 1, lines 25-44). Since the display panel in Morita suffers the same viewing angle problem as described in Endo, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to include the hinge mechanism of Endo into Morita so that the viewing angle problem could be avoided.

5. Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morita et al. (2002/0051098).

Regarding claims 6 and 7, Morita does not disclose the video interphone features as claimed, such as the main body microphone, the interphone processor, the video selector, the audio selector, and the telephone circuit as claimed. The examiner takes Official Notice that using a video interphone for communication enhances interactivity because it enables users to see each other while conversing. Since the monitor in Morita is intended to display video interphone images, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to include the well known video interphone system into Morita so that the intended purpose of the monitor could be fully utilized.

Regarding claim 8, Morita does not disclose the odor removing device including a basidiomycota mycelium bag and an electric heating unit as claimed. The examiner takes Official Notice that using such odor removing device to remove odor is well known in the art because it keeps the environment clean and healthy. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to include the well known odor removing device into Morita to perform the odor removing function as claimed.

Regarding claim 9, Morita does not disclose the home automation system as claimed. The examiner takes Official Notice that using home automation system to automate a living quarter, such as in a recreation vehicle or home, is

well known in the art because it improves the quality of life. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to include the well known home automation system into Morita to perform the well known automation functions as claimed.

6. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sensuke (2001-252140).

Regarding claim 1, Sensuke discloses a main body including a recessed part 5 or the accommodating part as claimed, a monitor (70) retracting in and extending out of the recessed part 5, and a connecting part (77) having hinge means and a ball joint. However, Sensuke does not explicitly show that the input part, the television signal receiving circuit, the speakers, and the controller are located at the main body as claimed. In any event, Sensuke does teach that the television circuit or personal computer can be stored in the recessed part 5 (note translation). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify Sensuke so that the input part, the television signal receiving circuit, the speakers, and the controller could be installed at the recessed part 5 as claimed. In addition to Sensuke's teaching, it is also well known that wall shelves and cabinets such as in Sensuke are normally used to stow electronic equipment. It is considered an obvious design choice and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. That is, a user would have been obvious to arrange the shelves 14 to stow video/audio equipment such as a tuner box, an audio/video receiver (amplifier), bookshelf speakers, entertainment center controllers, etc.

Regarding claim 2, note Figure 9.

Regarding claim 3, Sensuke does not disclose the inserting protrusion and the bracket with protrusion holes as claimed. Instead, the monitor 70 and the extension arm 77 in Sensuke are jointed by a ball joint type hinge mechanism 78 allowing two dimensional movements. Sensuke also discloses a T-type hinge 76, which is similar to the one as claimed. However, such hinge allows only one dimensional movement. It is understood that the hinge types in Sensuke are interchangeable with each other since they are all intended to provide different movements for the monitor 70 and must have been considered by Sensuke. Hence, if one of the horizontal and vertical movements of the monitor 70 is unimportant or can be sacrificed, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to replace the ball joint hinge 78 with the T-type hinge 76 so that the cost of product could be reduced since the latter costs less than the former.

Regarding claim 4, the monitor 70 has grip portions on both sides.

Regarding claim 5, the television receiver in Sensuke inherently includes a tuner, video processor, and an audio output part.

Regarding claims 6 and 7, Sensuke does not disclose the video interphone features as claimed, such as the main body microphone, the interphone processor with a camera, the video selector, the audio selector, and the telephone circuit as claimed. The examiner takes Official Notice that using a video interphone for communication can enhance a telephone conversation because it enables users to see each other while conversing. Since the monitor

in Sensuke is intended to display video interphone images, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to include the well known video interphone system into Sensuke so that the intended purpose of the monitor could be fully utilized.

Regarding claim 8, Sensuke does not disclose the odor removing device including a basidiomycota mycelium bag and an electric heating unit as claimed. The examiner takes Official Notice that using such odor removing device to remove odor is well known in the art because it keeps the environment clean and healthy. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to include the well known odor removing device into Sensuke to perform the odor removing function as claimed.

Regarding claim 9, Sensuke does not disclose the home automation system as claimed. The examiner takes Official Notice that using home automation system to automate a home is well known in the art because it improves the quality of life. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to include the well known home automation system into Sensuke to perform the well known automation functions as claimed.

Regarding claim 10, in addition of rejections above, Sensuke does not show that the cables are threaded through inside the connecting arms 77 and 75. The examiner takes Official Notice that hiding cables or wires inside the connecting arms are well known in the art because it provides a neat and safe

connection in between two means. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Sensuke so that the connecting cables could be made out of sight and hence a neater connection.

Regarding claim 11, Sensuke does not disclose the waterproofing packing as claimed. The examiner takes Official Notice that using waterproofing packing to protect an object is well known in the art because the packing protects the object from the elements. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to include the well waterproofing packing into Sensuke so that the support arm could be protected from the elements.

Regarding claim 12, Sensuke does not disclose the guide plate and drain hole as claimed. In any event, the examiner takes Official Notice that using guide plates and drain holes to divert water out of an area is well in the art. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to include the well known guide plates and drain holes into Sensuke so that the appliance could be used in a wet environment.

Regarding claim 13, the modified hinge as set forth in rejection to claim 3 is the same as claimed. That is, there would be a protrusion bracket with holes at the back of the monitor to receive the hinge axial from the supporting arm 77 which is similar to the hinges 73, 74 and 76.

Regarding 14, Sensuke does not specify the waterproof treated permanent magnet and metal sheet as claimed. In any event, the examiner takes

Official Notice that using a magnet to lock two objects together is well known in the art. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to use the well known magnet and sheet metal into Sensuke so that the monitor could be securely stored when it is in a retracted position.

Regarding claims 15-21, see the corresponding rejections as set forth above.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will

the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Lee whose telephone number 571-272-7349. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9 to 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sinh Tran, can be reached on 571-272-7564. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/M. Lee/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2622

